REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-20, and 22-104 are pending, with claims 1, 22, 28, 40, 45, 50, 94 and 95 being independent. Claims 28-54 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 22 and 94-96 have been amended, and claims 97-104 have been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Kester Rejection

Claims 95 and 96 were rejected as being anticipated by Kester (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,975). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 95 is directed to an electrical apparatus that includes a bonded disk stack in which adjacent MOV disks have face-to-face bonds with each other. The bonded disk stack has a rating of at least 6 kV and is "constructed so as to enable the disk stack to withstand at least one 100 kA impulse without breaking the face-to-face bonds."

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 95 because Kester does not describe or suggest a bonded disk stack in which adjacent MOV disks have face-to-face bonds. Instead, Kester describes a surge arrester subassembly that includes electrical components stacked in an axial array and an insulative coating disposed over the outer surface of the axial array. See Kester at col. 3, ll. 18-21. The array of electrical components is stacked in an end-to-end arrangement and retained in that arrangement by an axially applied force supplied by the insulative coating. See Kester at col. 4, ll. 26-28. Contact plates are disposed between the upper and lower faces of adjacent MOV disks. See Kester at col. 5, ll. 4-11. Kester provides no indication that the MOV disks are bonded to the contact plates or to each other.

Claim 96 depends from claim 95 and is allowable for at least this reason.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kester / Donnola Rejection

Claims 22-27 and 66-93 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kester in view of Donnola (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,813). Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 because neither Kester, Donnola, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a bonded disk stack in which adjacent MOV disks have face-to-face bonds, with the disk stack having a rating of at least 6 kV and being constructed so as to be able to withstand at least one 100 kA impulse without breaking the face-to-face bonds, as recited in claim 22. In particular, Donnola does not remedy the deficiencies of Kester that are discussed above with respect to claim 95. Indeed, like Kester, Donnola fails to provide any indication that adjacent MOV disks are bonded to one another, let alone that the device is configured to permit such bonds to withstand a 100 kA impulse. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 are respectfully requested.

Claims 23-27 and 66-93 depend from claim 22 and are allowable for at least this reason.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kester / Donnola / Schmidt Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 5-20 and 55-65 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kester in view of Donnola and Schmidt (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,710). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an electrical apparatus that includes a monolithic MOV disk having a rating of at least 6 kV and a reinforcing structure "constructed so as to enable the monolithic MOV disk to withstand at least one 100 kA impulse without cracking." Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Kester, Donnola, Schmidt, nor any combination of the three describes or suggests a monolithic MOV disk having a rating of at least 6 kV or a reinforcing structure that would enable such a monolithic MOV disk to withstand a 100 kA impulse without cracking.

Kester describes the example of a 10 kV distribution class surge arrester that includes three MOV disks. In view of the arrester's 10 kV rating, each MOV disk would have a rating of approximately 3 kV. Thus, Kester does not describe a monolithic MOV disk having a rating of 6

kV. Also, while Kester notes that the invention relates to the coating and "is not limited to any particular type, number of size of electrical components," this is no way indicates that the coating may be used to prevent cracking of a 6 kV MOV disk in response to a 100 kA impulse. Like Kester, Donnola and Schmidt also fail to describe or suggest the use of a 6 kV MOV disk. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5-20, and 55-65 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Kester / Schmidt Rejection

Claim 94 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kester in view of Schmidt. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Enclosed is a check totaling $1334 of which $144 is for excess claim fees and $420 is for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 22, 2004

Scott R. Boalick
Reg. No. 42,337

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331